

amendments offered by 5 p.m. tomorrow is being discussed in an effort to complete action on this legislation as early as possible this week.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator REED of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. I ask to speak pursuant to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

EDUCATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will speak this evening on an issue of great importance to the country and every family in America. That is the issue of education.

For the past 4 months, the Republicans and Democrats on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee have been working to come up with a bipartisan approach to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Sadly, those efforts have collapsed and we are being presented with a Republican bill, the Straight A's Act, which is essentially a block granting of critical programs and the amassing of Federal resources to be distributed with little accountability by the States.

This issue is of great importance because education is what I believe is fueling the great economic progress we are making today. The 5-percent growth in productivity in the last quarter recognizes the combination of American technology, which is a product of our ideas, our education, and the skills and talents of the American people that have been forged in the classrooms of America.

Just as importantly, this recognition of the centrality and importance of education is shared by every American because they the mothers and fathers of this country, recognize that the future of their families, the future of their children, are dependent almost exclusively on how well they are educated. As a result, we cannot take lightly the proposals that are before the Senate with regard to the educational policy of the United States.

There are some who do not think the National Government has a role in edu-

cation. I disagree. We recognize, of course, the primacy of States and localities in terms of forging educational policy, but we do have a role at the national level. We have a role of providing both encouragement and support for local innovation and also support to overcome local inertia.

We have seen that played out throughout our history. We have seen a situation where years ago the States were inattentive to the needs of low-income students, particularly minority students. That is one of the primary impulses for the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have seen in the past where States were indifferent to the education of students with disabilities, and we acted properly and appropriately to do that. So we do have this national role and we have to carry it out conscientiously, recognizing that public education is the bulwark of our society and our country.

Ninety percent of our students attend public schools. Public schools offer not only educational benefits but are the devices that bring us together, the common ground, the area in which one can enter and prepare to seize the opportunities of life without regard to race, creed, or ethnicity.

It is this public education system that we must enhance, reform, and reinvigorate. I argue that the approach to do that is not through block grants. The approach is a careful consideration of the appropriate Federal initiatives, both in terms of resources and in terms of programs, that will help stimulate reform at the local level and help overcome the inertia and the political gridlock we see every day at the localities and at the States just as they see on certain issues in Washington.

Again, I yield, as do all my colleagues, that the Federal Government is the junior partner in this partnership for education in America. We supply roughly 7 percent of all the resources; the States, the cities, and the towns supply 93 percent of the resources. However, we can do much, particularly in the area of focusing assistance on the neediest children and also, as I said before, to help invigorate our school system, to help accelerate reform.

Money isn't everything; it is vitally important, but we also need a sense of direction or purpose, of national statements about what is critical to the Nation as well as critical to localities and to States. That, too, is part and parcel to our deliberations about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We should be providing resources for local communities. One of the problems with the educational policy in the United States is it is tied so closely to property tax that we can witness situations where good school systems, particularly school systems in urban areas that were models of efficiency and expertise decades ago, have fallen on hard times because their property base has evaporated. People have moved to the suburbs; the industries have left the

central city and moved out. We can help, and we do that principally through title I programs.

Again, as we help with resources at the local level, we cannot give up the idea also that we have to provide this spark of innovation, the spark of reform that is so critical to the efforts. I believe also that this is recognized by many people at the State and local level, that our Goals 2000 initiative several years ago helped essentially start a reform process that was inchoate at the State and local level and many places that needed resources, even if there was a sense of reform. This effort, this identification of reform together with resources helped stimulate productive efforts that are improving the quality of education. But I also would say we have a long way to go before we can satisfy ourselves that every student in America, every child in America, has access to excellent public schools. That should be our goal, a goal we must insist upon.

Again, I am disappointed that efforts over the last several months to try to forge bipartisan compromise on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have failed, apparently, for the moment. Tomorrow in the committee we begin to debate a legislative proposal that is simply abdicating the responsibilities of the National Government to the States without any real accountability. That is a wrong approach.

We have seen that because we have seen what the States have done in contrast to what the Federal Government has done in some critical areas of concern. I am not trying to suggest there is any type of nefarious plot at the States, but we all have to recognize they are under very special pressures in terms of allocating funds, in terms of local problems, a host of local issues that complicate their politics, and we have an opportunity sometimes to avoid those internecine fights that go on and provide direction that they welcome and they, in fact, in many cases expect.

One aspect of this debate about Federal versus State perspectives is a report prepared by the General Accounting Office in 1998. It was found Federal aid was seven times more targeted to poor students than State programs overall. It found our effort to reach out and help low-income students was disproportionately greater than State efforts. I think you have to ask yourself, logically, had we not acted in 1965 with title I, and in Congresses subsequent to that date to help out low-income students, both in center-city areas and in rural areas, would they enjoy the limited success they have had to date? I am not suggesting we succeeded in that arena.

I suggest you might find that same proportion of funding, those who are politically powerful in States, those suburban areas, those areas that themselves with property tax can fund schools, would do much better. In fact,

our situation in center-city and rural areas would be much more severe without specified targeted Federal assistance—not a block grant, specified targeted Federal assistance.

I should point out in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—I was a Member of the other body at that time—we were aware of some of the shortcomings and limitations and inhibitions in the title I program, and we made changes to streamline it and make it more effective, as we did with several other programs. The results from the last few years seem to suggest this combination of more programmed and efficient Federal support, together with State initiatives, have led to real improvements. We want to continue that partnership and certainly those improvements.

There is another aspect, too, that affects the State and Federal Governments. I think sometimes we sit back and say: The States have it right; they know how to allocate and distribute funds. It turns out in over one-third of the States in these United States, people are suing the States claiming they are unfairly distributing their school aid. If we are going to turn around and give moneys to such a State without real accountability, without real direction, we, frankly, are running right into the teeth of those suits that are saying the States do not know how to spend their money fairly, wisely, or well; they are disadvantaging large parts of the population.

I think there are many reasons why we can argue with great credibility and force that Federal programs and Federal resources, national policies, can complement, supplement, help States do things that, because of politics, because of resource limitations, because of a host of reasons, they would not do of their own volition.

There is another issue, too, and it becomes, frankly, an issue that is much more specific to us today than it was 10 years ago or 20 years ago. We are in a global economy. Our competition is no longer between Rhode Island and South Carolina or Pennsylvania and Utah. It is between students in Singapore and in Japan and around the world versus American students. To suggest at this time there is not a national need for some direction, some support, some help to States to move forward their educational process is to disregard the global nature of the world we face today.

There are examples, frankly, of where we have acted successfully with federally directed programs to set national policies with national resources to facilitate State reform. One I mentioned previously is Goals 2000. I participated in the drafting of this legislation in 1994. I would have liked to have gone much further in terms of accountability, in terms of many other things. But the sense of the Congress and the administration was let's get into the States' resources with a direction to

begin to start reforming or helping their reform efforts. That took place. In fact, it has been acknowledged that Goals 2000 has been a force for reform in places such as Texas and Georgia and Vermont and elsewhere. Indeed, in 1998, in another GAO report, State and local officials stated:

Goals 2000 funding provided valuable assistance and that, without this funding, some reform efforts would not have been accomplished or would not have been accomplished as quickly.

Again, had we simply back in 1994 said take this money and do what you like, without some structure, some framework, it would not have been as successful, I believe, as it has been to date.

There is another area where we can play a critical role—it is a role we have played in the past—and that is educational technology. National investment in educational technology since 1994, in programs such as the Technological Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants, as well as the E-Rate, have led to a dramatic increase in the number of schools connected to the Internet. Again, these are very specific targeted national programs. Between 1994 and 1998, Internet access in public schools increased from 35 to 89 percent of schools. The percentage of public school instruction rooms with Internet access also increased during this time period from 3 percent in 1994 to 51 percent in 1998.

High poverty schools, which have long lagged behind wealthier schools in Internet access, were as likely to have Internet access as low-poverty-level schools by the fall of 1998 because of these initiatives—again, appropriate. We are not supplanting State and local efforts, but we are identifying a national need to wire up to the Internet the children in the classroom, providing resources, direction. It gets done. It succeeds.

There is still a need, in fact, for additional effort in that regard. That is why we are missing a real opportunity in this reauthorization to build upon the success of our technology initiatives. In fact, the gap between high- and low-poverty schools and the percentage of classrooms with Internet access does not seem to be stabilized. It seems to be a widening; there is a bit of widening at the gap. We have to continue to work to make sure that gap does not exist.

My colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, is often quoted talking about the digital divide; the fact that affluent students enjoy computer access at home and in classrooms. Low-income students do not have that opportunity. In the information age that digital divide could be decisive. So we have an opportunity to work now to build on prior success to ensure we truly close the digital divide.

There is another area—this one, I think, is very emblematic of the dangers of reflexively shifting from tar-

geted programs to block grants—and that is school libraries. In 1965, Congress enacted legislation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which included specific provisions to assist school libraries to buy library material, principally books. But in 1981, with the advent of the Reagan administration, this specific program was thrown into a large block grant.

Now what has happened? What happened is all the material that was bought in 1965 through the late 1960s and 1970s is still on the shelves and has not been replaced because when this library program was thrown into a block grant, local pressures took out the support to buy library books. It always seemed there was something else to crowd it out, some other immediate problem. As a result, what I believe is a strong national thought that children in our schools should have up-to-date, modern library books has withered away, and we can see the proof on the shelves of school libraries throughout this country.

When I was talking about this issue several years ago, a librarian in a school in Arizona sent me a book. The title was "The Constitution of the United States," by James Beck. But what I thought was interesting is that there was a foreword by the President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge. The book was written in 1924 and was still on the shelves in 1993.

I went to law school. I think there were a couple of amendments to the Constitution after 1924.

I would be hard pressed if I were a student in that school in Arizona to confirm or deny that fact.

There is another book found in Boston entitled "Planets, Stars, and Space" which noted:

Of course, the trip (to the moon) cannot yet be made. . . . It may be necessary to establish a giant artificial moon or satellite a thousand miles or so above the earth, from which to launch the moon rocket.

That is copyright 1957, and that was in a school library recently.

From my own home State, there was in a school library a book entitled "Ms. MD" which stated only men could enroll in Brown Medical School, and the tuition—this really dates it—was \$2,800 a year.

The effort to block grant the library program led to the deterioration and destruction of the library program, and as a result there are thousands of schools across the country that have books so out of date that if parents saw them, they would recall their child.

I hope we can change it. In this authorization, contrary to block grant, we can try to develop another library approach to assist libraries in buying not just books but CDs and all the media we need for an information age.

The other presumption is—in addition to the fact there is a presumption in some quarters that the States know how to spend the money—all of the successes are because of local initiatives. The reality is there are too many

failing schools in America, and the people directly responsible for these schools—we all admit it here—are the States and localities. I think that somewhat undercuts this notion of infallibility at the local level and supports the notion that at the national level, our ideas and our initiatives and complementary activities have a place and a purpose.

There are about 8,000 schools across the country which are failing their own standards set by their States—not national standards but State standards. Ask yourself: What is happening? Why are these schools not being reformed?

What has happened in our proposal, and I hope we can deal with it in the ESEA, is we are asking for more accountability by the States. We are asking them to tell us: What are you going to do about these 8,000 schools? How are you going to fix them? Do you need additional resources?

We are not trying to be prescriptive—one way to do it—but we want accountability. That, too, is going to be decisively lost if we simply turn over large block grants to Governors and say do what you will because doing what they will has led to 8,000 schools across this country failing their students, failing the parents, and failing the Nation. We should not tolerate that.

There is another area that is important that represents, in many cases, the clash of conflicting priorities at the local level and results in a poor educational environment for students. That is the issue of school modernization. There are schools in this country that are literally falling apart or so out of date that they impair the educational experience of children.

There are schools in my communities in Rhode Island that were built in 1876 and in 1898. In 1876, George Armstrong Custer lost a battle at the Little Big Horn. Much has changed since then, except children are still walking and busing to this school in a community in Rhode Island.

In the wintertime, the way they regulate the heat is they open the windows because once they turn that boiler on, it gets so hot that the only thing they can do to cool it down to room temperature is to open the windows. There is a trailer outside, but the trailer is not a good place to put computers because it is not fully air conditioned, not well ventilated. This is one example. These examples are replete throughout the entire country.

In Rhode Island, 81 percent of schools report a need to upgrade or repair a building to good overall condition. Again, this is an area where national assistance can be very helpful. There is not a weekend—and I go home every weekend—where I do not run into someone—a parent, a school committee person—who says: You know what, we sure could use some help fixing up our schools.

This is not some plot hatched in Washington, DC, to take over elementary and secondary education. This is

what people intimately involved in elementary and secondary education in our communities want us to do, but we will not be able to do it if we simply bundle up the money in a block grant and give it to the Governors.

I talked a good bit about some of the problems we have in our school system, some of the problems we have in terms of our response in the Senate to these issues. But I would be remiss if I did not mention some of the good news because of our efforts over the last several years.

It turns out that high school students are taking tougher mathematical and science courses because this notion of increased standards which began with the Governors' conference years ago and certainly were highlighted by the efforts of President Clinton, certainly underscored by the Goals 2000 Act, certainly reemphasized in the last reauthorization, this is leading to students taking tougher mathematical and science courses.

These increased participation rates are cutting across different lines of income, ethnicity, and race, which are very good signs for our country. Student mathematical achievement is improving. Between 1982 and 1986, students improved their achievement in mathematics, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

There is some good news, and it is the result not of the absence of the National Government from policy or solely because of the presence of national programs; it is because of this partnership that has been worked out, somewhat fluidly and sometimes roughly, over several decades between local initiatives and national complementary initiatives.

I could go on about student achievement. It is improving but not enough. Certainly, in international comparisons, we are not where we want and must be.

The other item is we have seen some of these improvements in math and science and some in part—I do not want to overstate this—might be attributable to a specific Federal national initiative, and that is the Eisenhower Professional Development Program established in 1984 to increase the quality of math and science teaching by giving math and science teachers opportunities to develop their expertise and understanding and to develop their techniques to teach; again, part of what I hope is good news about improving mathematical scores in this country.

Had we been presented with a bill in the HELP Committee which would have given us the opportunity to talk seriously about issues of programmatic content and national priorities, there are some things I would have liked to emphasize. I will mention them.

First, we have to improve the quality of teaching in the United States. We just had an amendment by my colleague, the Senator from Maine, Ms.

COLLINS. It was a very good amendment because it talked about allowing teachers to get more tax benefits for their investment in professional development, for taking courses in graduate school, and buying material. That is a good effort. Frankly, that is just the surface.

If we want to improve the performance of teachers in our schools, we have to go into the classroom. We do not have to send the teachers necessarily to graduate school. We have to go into the classroom. We have to embed professional development as part of the daily life of the school. That is not being done across this country.

What we have in many places is what I experienced as a child when I went to school, and that is the proverbial teacher's institute. It was the one day we celebrated because there was no school or no holiday. They just took the day off. Teachers went to a big conference center, listened to a speaker, chatted about all sorts of things, and that was professional development.

It does not work that way, particularly nowadays. They have to make professional development part and parcel of the school. They have to have senior teachers and principals involved in the professional development of their teachers. They have to have the flexibility to get substitute teachers into the classroom so teachers can get out and observe other teachers teaching. This is a national priority.

We should be able to give the States both financial assistance and a sense of direction about the best techniques, if you will, give them a spectrum, a menu of things from which they can choose. But we cannot do that if our fixation is just ship the money down to the Governor. We have to improve the quality of professional development.

A 1998 study in California found that the more teachers were engaged in ongoing curriculum-centered professional development, holding school conditions and student characteristics constant, the higher the students' mathematical achievements.

We know from the data, if you can embed professional development, put it in the life of the school, you can improve performance. That is what it is all about, not winning debating points but ensuring that the performance of students in the classrooms of this country improves and improves dramatically.

The teachers themselves recognize this. One in five talk about the fact they need more professional development, that what is being required of them by the States is inadequate. In fact, I believe the statistic would probably be higher if you pressed and probed more. So that is an area to which I would like to be able to devote attention. I am sure I will offer an amendment in the committee, but it is starkly different than the approach of simply shrugging our shoulders and saying: Let the Government figure it out.

We have ideas. We have an obligation to take what we see across this country and try to move States forward to do something that would improve the quality of education.

There is another area that is important. That area is parental involvement. The national PTA did a survey of public school parents and found that 91 percent believe it is "extremely important" for parents to be involved in their children's school, but more than half of the parents stated that schools need direction about how to make parents true partners in their children's education.

The overwhelming view of parents is they need to be more involved in the school. But a significant number say the schools are deaf to their concerns. They do not have the programs or the attitudes or the policies that will get parents into the schools.

This is particularly the case when you get to areas where there are low-income students because the reality is many times their parents have an unsuccessful educational experience. It is not as if school was a good place for them. There are also practical problems in many urban areas, and some rural areas, about language difficulties, about reaching out to parents in their own language to get them involved in the lives of their children. We have not, as a nation, been able to develop the kinds of policies and programs that assist States and localities in making parents real partners in their children's education. I hope we could do that. I hope we could do that by using ESEA to start thinking about ways we can jump-start parental involvement at the local level.

Again, you can always fall back to the point: Why is this not happening if the States have the vision, the resources, and the commitment to do it? Why should we tolerate it continuing in such a deplorable way if there is a lack of resources, vision, or commitment at the local level when we know it should and must be done?

As I mentioned, I would love very much to be able to take out some of those antiquated books on the library shelves of America and replace them with modern books that talk about the fact that we have landed on the Moon, that include all the amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Again, we will not be able to do that if we are simply block granting our educational dollars.

There is also a program that is based upon one State's experience helping another State. The States have long been described as laboratories of innovation and experiment. But I think we have a job, and that is to disseminate all that good work, making it available throughout the Nation, giving other States the incentive or the ideas or the resources to put in place what some States have succeeded so well in doing.

One program in Rhode Island is called the Child Opportunity Zones, COZs. These are places within schools that bring together all sorts of social

services, mental health services, child care services, and social work services. It is designed to assist the family, recognizing that the success of a child is dependent not only on his or her innate talent, and the teachers and the facilities, but also in the support and the participation of the whole family. If the family has problems, that child will likely have problems. Indeed, one of the things that has changed since my education is that family life in so many parts of this country has been terribly complicated by social problems, health care problems, issues that are not educational but decisively impact on the ability of a young child to learn.

I am encouraged that the President has sent up his budget proposing increases in Head Start. I have colleagues such as CHRIS DODD who are working valiantly to improve early childhood education. All of these things coming together recognize the fact that today, in so many places, it is not the educational problems holding children back; it is the health problem; it is the mental health problem; it is a host of problems that are outside the strict purview of what we used to think of as educational policy.

This COZ program is very successful in Rhode Island. It brings these disciplines to one place in the school. It gives families easy access to all of these disciplines.

Once again, this is an example of how the experience of one State—highlighted, illustrated, and disseminated by national legislation—can benefit the entire country. I would like very much to be able to work on that.

Finally, we come back to a major issue which will preoccupy all of us. That is this issue of accountability. Block grants, without accountability, are an abdication of our responsibility not only to have good educational policy but to the taxpayers. We cannot hand over millions of dollars with the assumption that States and localities are doing it right, when we know in some cases they do not invest enough in low-income education, that in some cases States and localities will not provide the kind of innovative change that is necessary for this new century.

We have to work hard to ensure we have accountability standards that work. I know Senator BINGAMAN has been a champion of this issue in the Senate. I worked with him as a Member of the other body in our reauthorization of the prior Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I anticipate, if we have a chance—and I hope we do—that both in committee and on the floor we will push hard for accountability. So we have a lot of work to do. It is national work. We simply cannot walk away from it.

Unfortunately, the approach that I see the Republican majority taking is effectively walking away from it, to hand it off to the States, to step back and say it is not our job, not our role, when, in fact, we can and should be a

partner, the junior partner but a partner, in this effort to improve education throughout the United States.

We have made progress. Statistics are encouraging in relation to student performance, but we will give up this progress, I fear, if we do not innovate, if we do not continue to support local initiatives, and if we do not continue to try to overcome the local inertia that leads to 8,000 failing schools, that leads to a malapportionment of dollars between poor students and more affluent students.

It is a national role that we have long had. It is increasingly a national priority, as we face a world of international competition, as we face a world where the future of our families literally depends upon the quality of the education that our children receive.

I hope that in this great debate we will, in fact, be able to talk about libraries, talk about child opportunity zones, talk about improving the accountability, and talk about how we can put technology into classrooms, not simply to walk away from this issue with the assumption that the States can and will do it.

CONGRATULATING AND THANKING CHAIRMAN ROBERT F. BENNETT AND VICE CHAIRMAN CHRISTOPHER J. DODD AND THE MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE YEAR 2000 TECHNOLOGY PROBLEM

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 264, submitted earlier by Senators LOTT, DASCHLE, MOYNIHAN, STEVENS, and BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 264) congratulating and thanking Chairman Robert F. Bennett and Vice Chairman Christopher J. Dodd for their tremendous leadership, poise, and dedication in leading the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem and commending the members of the Committee for their fine work.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem prepares to release its final report and disband today, I think it is only appropriate to thank our Chairman ROBERT F. BENNETT and Vice Chairman CHRISTOPHER J. DODD for the tremendous job that they did. They assembled the committee, held hearings to measure the problem, and in the end led the nation and world in ameliorating it. Well done.

We are told that nothing is more permanent than "temporary," especially with regard to congressional committees. But our special committee did its job, in the time allotted—under Senate Resolution 208, the committee was to